## REMARKS

Claims 1-31 have been canceled. New claims 32-38 have been added. By the foregoing amendments, no new matter has been added.

Before addressing the merits of the grounds of rejection, Applicant provides the following brief description of the invention. The claimed invention relates to a method and system for distributed image processing that (a) reduces the amount of processing that a host site performs on the images received from a user computer and (b) speeds up how quickly a customer on a customer computer can view requested images. In one embodiment, the method comprises receiving both image data and image related data regarding user images from a user computer, the image data being pre-processed or manipulated by a user with the user computer, which in turn greatly reducing the amount of processing performed at the host site. The image related data generally includes an image description, an image capture date, and/or an image price. The method further comprises receiving an image request for a subset of the user images from the customer computer, and adding a JPEG header to the stored image data for each of the requested user images to generate modified image data for each of the requested user images. Adding the JPEG header converts the stored image data from the binary large objects (blob) format, and thereby allows the customer on the customer computer to more quickly view the requested images.

The Examiner rejected Claims 23-26 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In the interest of advancing this application to allowance, Applicant has canceled these claims. This ground of rejection is therefore moot.

The Examiner rejected claims rejected Claims 1-22 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manolis et al. The Examiner also rejected Claims 23-26 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manolis et al. in view of Official Notice. Applicant respectfully disagrees with each of the Examiner's rejections and characterization of the cited prior art. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution of this application, the

Applicant has now cancelled Claim 1-31.

With respect to new independent Claims 32, 33, and 37, the invention involves receiving both image data and image related data regarding user images from a user computer, the image data being pre-processed or manipulated by a user on the user computer. This greatly reduces the amount of processing that a host site performs on the user images received from a user computer. Further, Claims 32, 33, and 37 recite "adding a JPEG header to the stored image data for each of the requested user images to generate modified image data for each of the requested user images." This allows the customer on the customer computer to more quickly view the requested images, which is a vast improvement over the prior art. This is explained in the specification, which states:

> [I]n prior art methods, after a browser requested an image from the host site, the communication server must obtain an image pointer from the database server 108 (via the application server 106), retrieve the image from the remote image file 112, add a JPEG HTTP header, and then send the image to the requesting entity. The present invention obviates the need for the communication server to use a pointer to retrieve the image from the remote file location and to add the JPEG header, which is added by the application server. Thus, the present invention allows users and customers to view requested images faster than is possible in prior art methods and also preserves processing resources at the host site.

Page 17, lines 6-14 of specification. The prior art of records fails to teach or suggest such the above described combination of limitations.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 32-38 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a three-month extension of time, extending to November 2, 2007, the period for response to the Office Action dated May 2, 2007. The

Commissioner is authorized to charge $525 for the three-month extension of time pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(3), and any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 2, 2007

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,549

**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000